



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,657	06/29/2001	Victor R. Herrero	POU920010051US1	8494

23334 7590 08/24/2005

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI  
& BIANCO P.L.  
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER  
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111  
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
----------

ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2193

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/896,657	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HERRERO, VICTOR R.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Trenton J. Roche	<b>Art Unit</b> 2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2005.  
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2193

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed 10 May 2005.
2. Per applicant's request, amended claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 12 and 17 have been entered. Claims 1-15 and 17 are pending.
3. Claims 1-15 and 17 have been examined.

### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3-12, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0011238 A1 to Eberhard et al. (hereinafter "Eberhard"), in view of U.S. Patent 5,845,077 to Fawcett.

### **Per claim 1:**

Eberhard discloses:

Art Unit: 2193

- presenting to a user a list of products on a client system; receiving a user selection for ordering at least one product from the list of products on a product ordering server (Note Figure 2A, items 200 and 202 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- receiving a response to the order for at least one product from the product ordering server, the response includes an entitlement ID for authorizing the use of the product, wherein the entitlement ID is sent from the product ordering server to the product delivery server (“The retailer server...responds to a purchase request from a user...In addition, the ID of the reader and the indicia of the requested publication...is supplied to an authentication server...The authentication server...typically passes to the publisher server...a confirmed request for a file...” in paragraph 0025. Further, note Figure 2B, item 258.)
- requesting a download copy of the at least one product from the product delivery server, the request includes the entitlement ID previously received from the product ordering server (Note Figure 2B, items 262 and 222 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- receiving, in response to the entitlement ID received from the product ordering server matching the entitlement ID received with a request for the download copy, the copy of the at least one product from a staging server as part of a payload (Note Figure 2B, item 228 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

substantially as claimed. Eberhard does not explicitly disclose that the product is software, nor does Eberhard disclose the installation of the software product after receiving the software product, nor the inclusion of an installation script. Fawcett discloses in an analogous client/server user-selection update system the ability to enable a user to view and purchase software for installation and to automatically install the application independently of the user (“a user selection of desired software...” in col. 11 lines 60-61. Further, “downloading the desired software to the first computer,

Art Unit: 2193

and installing the desired software on the first computer...” in col. 12 lines 42-44. The installation is performed automatically, as shown in col. 10 lines 49-54.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the distribution system of Eberhard to allow software distribution and installation as described by Fawcett, as this allow a user to purchase and install software easily via the Internet, further allowing publishers to maintain custody of their exclusive content and ensure protection of the publisher’s rights, as noted in paragraph 0009 and 0010 of Eberhard.

**Per claim 3:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Eberhard does not explicitly disclose sending system information as claimed. Fawcett discloses the ability to send system information as claimed (Note at least Figure 4A, item 70 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send system information as disclosed by Fawcett to a product distribution server as disclosed by Eberhard, as this would allow the product server to identify new computer software, patches, and fixed required by the client, as disclosed by Fawcett in col. 7 lines 23-44.

**Per claim 4:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Eberhard does not explicitly disclose the ordering of the software file from the software ordering server only when the software file is needed for use. Fawcett discloses the downloading of software files only when the software files are needed (“indicating software available...and not installed on the user computer...an alert about a defect in software on the user computer correctable by software available...” in col. 13 lines 3-8). It would

Art Unit: 2193

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the product ordering system disclosed by Eberhard order only when a software file is required as disclosed by Fawcett, as this would increase user productivity by not requiring the user to constantly check for software updates.

**Per claims 5-8:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Eberhard does not explicitly disclose that the installation of the received copy of the at least one software file requires no further intervention from the software ordering server, requires no client user intervention, does not allow any choices or options by a user, and obviates the need for help to install as claimed. Fawcett discloses an automated installation process requiring no further intervention from the ordering server, a user, or additional help ("With automatic downloading and installation of computer software from the update service, the user is relieved from the burden of obtaining software...and installing the computer software on the user computer." in col. 10 lines 49-56. The automated installation sequence inherently would not require user intervention, allow user choices, and obviate the need for help to install.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an automated installation system as disclosed by Fawcett in the product ordering system disclosed by Eberhard, as this would relieve the burden of obtaining computer software and installing the computer software on the user, thereby simplifying computer use, as disclosed by Fawcett in col. 10 lines 50-53.

**Per claim 9:**

Eberhard discloses:

Art Unit: 2193

- receiving from a software ordering server, an entitlement ID for authorizing the use of the product which has been previously ordered on a client system (“The retailer server...responds to a purchase request from a user...In addition, the ID of the reader and the indicia of the requested publication...is supplied to an authentication server...The authentication server...typically passes to the publisher server...a confirmed request for a file...” in paragraph 0025. Further, note Figure 2B, item 258.)
- receiving a request from the client system for the download of a copy of the at least one product to the client system, wherein the request includes an entitlement ID used to order the software file (Note Figure 2B, items 262 and 222 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- verifying that the entitlement ID received from the ordering server matches the entitlement ID used to order the at least one file (Note Figure 2B, item 224 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- scheduling the download of the requested product from a staging server to the client system (Note Figure 2B, item 228 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

substantially as claimed. Eberhard does not explicitly disclose that the product is software, nor does Eberhard disclose verifying the client system’s PC compatibility for the requested copy of at least one software file. Fawcett discloses in an analogous client/server user-selection update system the ability to enable a user to view and purchase software for installation and checking the client system’s PC compatibility as claimed (“a user selection of desired software...” in col. 11 lines 60-61. Further, note Figure 4A, item 72 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the distribution system of Eberhard to allow software distribution and installation as described by

Art Unit: 2193

Fawcett, as this allow a user to purchase and install software easily via the Internet, further allowing publishers to maintain custody of their exclusive content and ensure protection of the publisher's rights, as noted in paragraph 0009 and 0010 of Eberhard.

**Per claim 10:**

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 3.

**Per claim 11:**

Eberhard discloses:

- receiving an order entitlement ID for at least one product, which has been previously ordered from a client system on a product ordering server ("The retailer server...responds to a purchase request from a user...In addition, the ID of the reader and the indicia of the requested publication...is supplied to an authentication server...The authentication server...typically passes to the publisher server...a confirmed request for a file..." in paragraph 0025. Further, note Figure 2B, item 258.)
- storing the entitlement ID for at least one product in a database ("provides the customer or reader specific indicia...to the retailer's server...this information can be...stored...on the server..." in paragraph 0024)
- receiving a request for the down-load of at least one requested product with a download entitlement ID from a client system (Note Figure 2B, items 262 and 222 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- determining if the downloaded entitlement ID matches the order entitlement ID previously stored in the database, and in response to the order entitlement ID matching the download



Art Unit: 2193

entitlement ID; and scheduling a response to the request for a copy of the at least one product at a scheduling server (Note Figure 2B, items 262, 222, 224, and 228 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

substantially as claimed. Eberhard does not explicitly disclose that the product is software, nor does Eberhard disclose the installation of the software product after receiving the software product. Fawcett discloses in an analogous client/server user-selection update system the ability to enable a user to view and purchase software for installation and to automatically install the application independently of the user (“a user selection of desired software...” in col. 11 lines 60-61. Further, “downloading the desired software to the first computer, and installing the desired software on the first computer...” in col. 12 lines 42-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the distribution system of Eberhard to allow software distribution and installation as described by Fawcett, as this allow a user to purchase and install software easily via the Internet, further allowing publishers to maintain custody of their exclusive content and ensure protection of the publisher’s rights, as noted in paragraph 0009 and 0010 of Eberhard.

**Per claim 12:**

Claim 12 is directed to a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 1.

**Per claim 14:**

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 3.

Art Unit: 2193

**Per claims 15 and 17:**

Claims 15 and 17 do not further disclose or teach any new matter beyond that which is disclosed in independent claim 11, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

7. Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0011238 A1 to Eberhard et al. (hereinafter "Eberhard"), in view of U.S. Patent 5,845,077 to Fawcett., further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0128975 A1 to Klemba et al. (hereinafter "Klemba").

**Per claim 2:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Eberhard nor Fawcett explicitly disclose receiving a request for acceptance of a software license agreement, and sending the acceptance to the software delivery server. Klemba discloses in an analogous client/server software distribution system the act of requesting acceptance of a software license agreement, and sending the acceptance to the software delivery server as claimed ("upon agreement of the EULA..." in paragraph 0037). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the license agreement ability of Klemba with the software distribution system of Eberhard, modified by Fawcett, as this would enable a vendor to impose legal standards on the to-be installed software in the system of Eberhard, modified by Fawcett.

**Per claim 13:**

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 2.

Art Unit: 2193

***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trenton J. Roche whose telephone number is (571) 272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trenton J Roche  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2193

TJR

  
**WEI Y. ZHEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**